

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Northern District of California

San Francisco Division

ANGELIA GREEN,

No. C 14-04281 LB

Plaintiff,

**ORDER TO SHOW CASE RE:
FAILURE TO PROSECUTE**

v.

CENTRAL MORTGAGE COMPANY,

Defendant.

On September 23, 2014, Plaintiff Angelia Green, who is proceeding pro se, filed a complaint against Central Mortgage Company. Complaint, ECF No. 1.¹ She did not pay the required filing fee; instead, she filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis. IFP Application, ECF No. 3. On September 26, 2014, the court denied her application and ordered Plaintiff to pay \$50.00 toward the filing fee no later than October 24, 2014. 9/26/2014 Order, ECF No. 5. The court warned Plaintiff that failure to do so could result in her action being dismissed. *Id.*

To date, the court has received no indication that Plaintiff has paid the \$50.00. *See generally* Docket. She also has ignored the Clerk of the Court's notices asking her to either consent to or decline the undersigned's jurisdiction. *See* 10/21/2014 Clerk's Notice, ECF No. 6; 11/3/2014 Clerk's Notice, ECF No. 7. In short, she appears to be AWOL.

Accordingly, the court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause why the case should not be dismissed

¹ Citations are to the Electronic Case File ("ECF") with pin cites to the ECF-generated page numbers at the top of the document.

1 for her failure to prosecute it. She shall do so by filing a written explanation no later than
2 **December 1, 2014.** Failure to do so may result in dismissal of the case without prejudice for failure
3 to prosecute. See *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (court may dismiss an
4 action based on a party's failure to prosecute an action); *see also Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d
5 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (setting forth five non-exhaustive factors for the court to consider).

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 Dated: November 20, 2014



8 LAUREL BEELER
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28